

REMARKS

Independent claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bleys ('226), Bleys ('779), or Eling ('483) each in view of Payne ('310). In the Office action, the examiner asserts that the primary references, *e.g.* Bleys, Bleys, and Eling, are silent with respect to the claimed process of coating a mold with an external release agent and producing at least 10 moldings prior to recoating the mold with the external release agent. Thus, the examiner relies on Payne to cure the deficiencies of the primary references.

As amended, claim 1 recites, “applying a conventional external mould release agent.” Support for this amendment may be found in the specification at least at page 12, line 27- page 13, line 2 and page 14, lines 10-12 (for instance, a wax is used in the Example 1). Payne teaches away from a conventional external mould release agent. For instance, Payne states, “[t]raditional sacrificial release agents such as waxes and soaps provide molders with limited numbers of releases before recoating is required” and that an object of his invention is to “provide a more durable release coating.” Column 1, lines 45-52. In contrast, the embodiment of claim 1 does not require a special, “more durable” release agent; it works with conventional mould release agents. As Payne teaches away from the use of traditional or conventional mould release agents, claim 1 is not obvious over the cited references. For at least this reason, amended claim 1 and claims dependent thereon are patentably distinguished over the cited references.

Claim 1 was also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Bleys ('226), Bleys ('779), or Eling ('483) each in view of Lopes ('714). Like Payne, Lopes is directed mould release agents that are specialized. *See, e.g.*, column 4 lines 4-6. In contrast, the applicants took a different approach and found that by using, in their reaction mixture, relatively high amounts of a polyether polyol that, in turn, has a relatively high EO content to make a low-density polyurethane article, a large number of these low-density polyurethane articles can be made without having to re-treat the mould with a conventional external mould release agent. In other words, in an embodiment of the present invention, the mould release agent does not have to be a specialized mould release agent, which is contrary to the teachings of Lopes (and Payne). Furthermore, Lopes discloses that “[a]ll components should be free of water.” Column 6, lines 49-55. This statement teaches away from the use of water, especially quantities of water that are not minuscule. As Lopes does not cure the deficiency of the primary references and as Lopes

teaches away from claim 1, claim 1 and claims dependent thereon are patentable over the cited references.

Under similar analyses, amended claim 16 and claims dependent thereon are also patentably distinguished over the cited references.

Claims 22 and 23 are cancelled by this amendment; thus, the § 112 rejection thereof is moot.

CONCLUSION

As none of the references, alone or in combination, teach or suggest amended claims 1 and 16 and claims dependent thereon, the examiner is requested to withdraw the rejections and allow the application to pass to issue.

April 17, 2008
Date

Respectfully submitted,



Rhonda L. Sheldon
Registration No. 50,457
Attorney for Assignee